REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 22-26, 61-67, and 126-149 are currently pending in this application. Claims 22, 61, 126, 128, 134, 139, and 146 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 22, 61, 126, 128, 134, 139, and 146.

Acknowledgement of Priority

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the claim to foreign priority for the present application based on European Patent No. 99402353.9 filed on September 27, 1999, European Patent No. 99402721.7 filed November 2, 1999, and European Patent No. 00300832.3 filed February 3, 2000.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the drawings filed on March 26, 2002.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 127, 129, and 138 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 127 and 138 have been amended by this reply in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, claim 127 has been amended to depend from independent claim 126, and claim 138 has been amended to change the phrase "the first window" to "the window", correcting the antecedent basis issue pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-26, 61-67, 134-138, 140-141, 143, and 145-149 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,831,615 ("Drews"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a method of drawing in a window of a windowing system. A windowing system is used to allow different window contents, for example, graphical objects, text, etc., to be displayed simultaneously in different areas on a screen. Windows in a conventional windowing system comprise rectangles in which graphical objects may be drawn for display against an opaque background. In the present invention, windows are displayed such that underlying objects are visible (*See* Specification, page 1, lines 14-33).

Further, the claimed invention provides a first mode in which a signal (*i.e.,* an expose event) is sent following each drawing operation. Particularly, the signal instructs a client of a window affected by the drawing operation performed, to redraw at least part of the affected window. In some cases, sending a signal to redraw affected windows to clients each time a drawing operation completes may result in a large number of redrawing operations. Thus, the claimed invention also provides for a second mode in which the sending of the signal is suppressed (*See* Specification, page 4). Suppression of the signal may result in the signal either not being sent or not being received. Embodiments of the invention provide for the suppression of the signal for any number of drawing operations. For example, if there are to be ten drawing operations performed, the suppression of the signal sent to clients of affected windows may be for every five drawings operations (*See* Specification, page 33, lines 15-17). Thus, the signal may be sent to affected clients after the completion of every five drawing operations.

Advantageously, the claimed invention allows for relatively simple drawing operations to be carried out in the first mode, where a signal is sent after every drawing operations, in which case the affected windows may be continually updated, and more complex multiple drawing operations to be carried out in the second mode, where the signal is suppressed. This in turn reduces the amount of processing associated with redrawing of affected windows (*See* Specification, page 5, lines 1-10).

In contrast to the present invention, Drews teaches a method for re-drawing a transparent window, which is located at least partly on top of a second window. In Drews, it is determined whether the second window is active. If the second window is active, then the transparent window is hidden and the second window is redrawn and the transparent window is shown. If the second window is inactive, then the transparent window is maintained.

With respect to the rejection of the claims, Drews fails to disclose several limitations of the claimed invention. Particularly, the Examiner cited column 11, lines 32-63 and column 12, lines 11-12 in asserting that Drews discloses "a first mode in which a signal is sent following each drawing operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. The cited portions of Drews disclose showing or drawing an object having either a foreground only or both of foreground and a background. Drews discloses that in order to draw an object in a window, the window is set to have a transparent background so that the foreground of the object may be drawn. Drews also discloses an annotation window, which is transparent so that the text of an underlying document can be seen. However, Drews is completely silent regarding sending of a signal to a client. Further, the cited portions of Drews disclose a yield processor, which allows other applications to re-draw their windows and contents. Particularly, Drews discloses the use of multiple threads. The thread that hides the window in Drews *yields the processor* to make sure that other applications get a chance to redraw their contents. The yield processor is *not equivalent* to the signal sent in the claimed invention, because the signal of the claimed invention instructs other clients to perform an action (*e.g.,* redraw a portion of a window affected by a drawing operation), whereas the yield processor simply ensures that one particular window does not monopolize the processor. In fact, the signal sent in the claimed invention has nothing to do with the processor. Rather, the signal *notifies a client* to redraw an affected portion of the client's window. Thus, it is clear that Drews fails to disclose or suggest sending a signal after each drawing operation, as required by independent claim 22 of the present invention.

Further, the Examiner admits on page 3 of the Office Action mailed January 12, 2005, that Drews fails to explicitly teach a second mode in which the sending of a signal is suppressed. As described above, the signal notifying the client may be suppressed to reduce the number of redraw operations performed for complex drawing operations. Drews is completely silent

regarding this limitation. In fact, because Drews fails to disclose or suggest a signal sent as described above, Drews necessarily cannot disclose or suggest the suppression of such a signal. Further, the cited portions of Drews disclose *yielding of the processor* for redrawing operations, which is not equivalent to the suppression of a signal sent to clients of affected windows, as required by independent claim 22 of the present invention. Drews discloses that yielding of the processor may or may not be repeated, but this is completely unrelated to the suppression of the signal claimed in the present invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that Drews fails to render independent claim 22 as obvious. Dependent claims 23-26 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claims 61, 126, 128, 134, 139, and 146 include similar allowable subject matter (*i.e.,* sending/receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that window) and are patentable over Drews for at least the reasons described with respect to claim 22. Dependent claims 62-67, 127, 129-133, 135-138, 140-145, and 147-149 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 126, 128, 130-133, 139, and 142 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews in view of U.S. Patent No, 6,400,379 ("Johnson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Drews fails to disclose the limitations of independent claims 126, 128, and 139. Further, Johnson fails to supply that which Drews lacks. Particularly, Johnson relates to selectively displaying additional information relating to broadcast information. Johnson is completely silent regarding the sending of signals to a client of an affected window. Thus, independent claims 126, 128, and 139 are patentable over Drews and Johnson, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 130-133 and 142 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/047001).

Dated: March 9, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
Osha & May L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

92455_1.DOC